

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DWIGHT A. CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-10394

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CLINTON VAZQUEZ, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER (1) DENYING APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS (ECF No. 2) AND (2) DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S
COMPLAINT (ECF No. 1) WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

On February 16, 2024, Plaintiff Dwight A. Campbell filed this action against Defendants Clinton Vazquez, the Logan Township Police Department, and the United States Marshal Service. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) Campbell has not paid the filing fee in this action. Nor has he filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Instead, Campbell filed what he called a “Statement of Filing Fee” in which he said that he was previously granted *in forma pauperis* status in an unrelated 2022 state court case. (*See* Statement, ECF No. 2.) The Court construes Campbell’s “Statement” as a request to proceed *in forma pauperis* and **DENIES** it because Campbell has not provided the Court any basis to conclude that he is indigent and/or is unable to pay the required filing fee. Simply put, the fact that Campbell may have

been granted *in forma pauperis* status in a state court case several years ago does not provide a basis for the Court to grant him similar status here.

At this point, the Court would ordinarily provide Campbell the opportunity to renew his request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, but it has no ability to do so in this case because it does not have valid contact information for Campbell. On February 20, 2024, the Court issued a notice informing Campbell that pursuant to Local Rule 11.2, he was required to “promptly file a notice with the Clerk and serve a copy of the notice on all parties whenever [his] address[es], e-mail address[es], phone number[s] and/or other contact information changes” (the “Change of Address Notice”). (See Change of Address Notice and Certificate of Service, ECF No. 4, PageID.18, citing E.D. Mich. Local Rule 11.2.) The Court warned Campbell in the Change of Address Notice that the “failure to promptly notify the court of a change in address or other contact information may result in the **dismissal** of [his] case.” (*Id.*; emphasis in original).

On March 8, 2024, the Change of Address Notice returned to the Court as undeliverable. (See ECF No. 5.) The failure by a plaintiff to update his contact information is not a mere technical violation of the rules. Without a current address or accurate contact information, the Court has no way of administering this civil action.

Accordingly, because Campbell has failed to comply with Local Rule 11.2 by updating his current address, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** Campbell's Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: April 16, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on April 16, 2024, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126